

**From:** canestro [mailto:canestro@mail.lifesci.ucsb.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 28, 2005 7:04 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** Message for Phil Isenberg re: MLPA funding opportunities

Dear Chairman Isenberg,

I want to thank you for all your efforts on the MLPA initiative, especially for carefully conducting the BRTF meeting in San Luis Obispo today. Your political experience and insights, and sense of humor keep the meetings on track and in perspective.

Below is a letter I recently sent to the Central Coast RWQCB regarding mitigation options for the entrainment impacts of the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant. It is a potential source for funding for monitoring and enforcement of MPAs, which is obviously an important issue.

Unfortunately John Ugoretz expressed F&G's official position of not wanting funds for MLPA monitoring and enforcement at a recent RWQCB meeting. I am sure there are lots of logical political reasons for this position.

As you will read in my letter the independent scientists and Central Coast RWQCB staff have stated that supporting the monitoring and enforcement (not the implementation process) of MPAs under the MLPA, is a great means of conserving marine resources. They state it is a better way to conserve marine resources than an alternate proposal for artificial reefs, but is definitely not in-kind mitigation. I can understand how F&G might be sensitive to the fact that supporting MPAs is like taking fishing habitat from fishermen, and as the entrainment by the power plant already has.

From where I sit someone in a higher place needs to get the RWQCB and F&G Department on the same page to discuss/take advantage of this opportunity, as well as prepare for future funding opportunities from mitigation funds.

Thanks for your time.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
11 September 2005

I am writing to comment on September 9, 2005 Agenda Item 15, PG&E Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), San Luis Obispo County. I attended the meeting, but was unable to stay for the public comment period.

I am currently serving on the Marine Life Protection Act's (MLPA) Statewide Interest Group and the Central Coast Study Region's Stakeholders Group. I am representing the perspective of scientists and educators who study and use California's marine resources. I am a UCSB employee, working as the Director of the Ken Norris Rancho Marino Reserve, Cambria, CA. I also have a master's degree in marine biology, from Moss Landing Marine Laboratories.

- It is my understanding that if F&G has no funding for monitoring and enforcement, the network of marine protected areas (MPA) mandated by the MLPA will not be implemented. F&G regularly accepts mitigation funds. I want to

express my support for the independent scientists view that supporting the monitoring and enforcement (not the implementation process) of marine reserves under the MLPA, is a great means of conserving marine resources. It would serve as compensation for damages from the entrainment of organisms by the DCP. Although at the meeting it was suggested that the MLPA's marine reserves would be implemented even without mitigation funds, that is not necessarily so. It is expected the long-term benefit to the environment will exceed short-term costs to fishermen. In the Channel Is. approximately 19% of state waters were set aside as MPAs.

- If artificial reefs are used as a more direct/in-kind form of mitigation, it would be valuable to establish a design that addresses the question of the impacts of fishing on the marine environment. One way of doing this would be to setup modules that were fished and comparing them to others that weren't fished is. Require monitoring that rigorously evaluates the design criteria. This approach combined with support for MPAs that restrict fishing, would help conserve California's marine resources and help evaluate the effects of fishing in a precise manner.

- Mitigation should be done for past harm and not be allowed to compensate for future damages. Evaluation of mitigation programs you prescribe will provide an estimate for future mitigation requirements.

- I support the independent scientists view that supporting abalone restoration is expensive has much less value than supporting MPA (monitoring and enforcement) or the development of artificial reefs.

Thanks for your time and best of luck with a very challenging decision.

Sincerely,

--

Don Canestro Reserve Director  
University of California Santa Barbara  
Ken Norris Rancho Marino Reserve  
393 Ardath Rd.  
Cambria, CA 93428

805 927-6833 voice & fax  
canestro@lifesci.ucsb.edu  
On line project applications: <http://RanchoMarino.ucnrs.org/>  
Overview: <http://www.californiacoastline.org> Images 1927-1938  
Lat N 35 32.36/Lon 121 05.70 to Lat N 35 31.36/Lon 121 04.88